

Life--is Made By Liberty: I Need Internet Rights

'Net Neutrality' is an essential precondition to free speech, expressed in the form of this medium, to equality of opportunity and to continued economic innovation in America.

Since the FCC's commissioners unwisely removed this basic protection in 2005, the chief executives of phone and cable corporate entities have stated their deliberate intention to become the Internet's 'gatekeepers'.

Excuse me--but this is censorship and favoritism: it is a bigotry aimed squarely against the categorical equality of each adult legal citizen--one whose perpetrators intend to use in order to discriminate against Web sites owners who don't pay their confiscatory and illegal added tolls.

Calling such a theft a "law" isn't going to change anything; it will still set up a class system in regard to freedom of speech, of the press and of artistic statement and of access to their potential marketplaces. And that system of privileges, thefts and censorships will affect creators, news sources, readers, buyers and sellers all across the breadth of this nation and far beyond.

This fundamental and totalitarian change would end the open Internet as we have known it. It would severely damage my ability to connect with others, to share information and to participate in our 21st century's form of US democracy and the US economy. And it would impoverish the Internet to a crippling degree.

The FCC's commissioners were chartered for one purpose: to safeguard selfish life, liberty and the pursuit of priorities (volitionally chosen)--after scientist-drawn regulations of non-negligence have been satisfied--by every citizen acting in individual equality. Nothing was said about creating tsaristic "gatekeepers", financial thieves nor de fact censors. No such outcome was intended.

Their mandate is unarguable: to ensure that broadband providers do n NOT become collectivist monopolists--and then to try to block, interfere with or discriminate against any lawful Internet trafficker, basing their actions upon the ownership, source, content or destination of the fictional or nonfictional information [provider(s)] messages.

I am a writer. I gain publication on the Internet by superior ability--and I depend upon access to other minds for this to happen. Those with whom I have placed works are virtually all "amateurs" in the sense of being lovers of excellence, not purveyors of low-grade populist material without regard to desert.

My criticisms ,which I claim are as carefully thought out and as well-written as I can make them, also

mostly appear on sites that would be adversely affected by a public-interest-excused totalitarian privilege. Such a dictatorship handed to monopolists so they could choke off dissent, censor content without legal cause and otherwise demand extortionate fees from legal participants in the most American marketplace we have going would create an ethical disaster and economic hardships to our most creative mind, mine among them.

Liberty to pursue chosen categorical and specific sorts of "happiness-producing" results, as a personal priority, applies as a regulatory constraint upon would-be collectivists and other criminals. Not\ public-interest exists; no public exists, save as a fantasy collective term for two or more, two or three hundred million citizens fantasized as a single life-entity--whose infallible brain some media tsar claims to be.

Only one human being exists at a time, as a responsible citizen-adult acting under regulations to claim rights. One place, one marketplace of exchanged values where he or she do this is The Internet.

Rights in fictional and non-fictional media exchanges fall under the general aegis of categorical freedom of speech, of the press and of dissent (assembly). The categorical form of such statements must be regulated, far better than it is at present, I assert; but, the specific content of any man's ideas otherwise constitutes the liberty any individual(s) possess in this sphere.

Take that away--nothing is left. Creating a two-tiered class system of corporate gangsters on the one hand and victims of their extortion on the other would be like charging the larger customer less per pound, charging more for the short haul than the long, and making de facto government-licensed thieves of corrupt corporations. It would be conferring pseudo-nobility onto men who have done NOTHING to earn class superiority, nor even mental superiority in any way, shape or form. It would be one of the biggest swindles in the history of the world, financially, and intellectually.

Rights are a categorical issue; under our Constitution, in the three main marketplaces, which need category-level definition to work legally--they belong equally to every adults citizens EQUALLY--or they do not exist.

Whatever arguments those desiring to become major thieves, interferers, censors, extortionists or dictators may advance, they all come down to one simply paradigm: the collective.

In the name of a nonexistent group's fantasized life-good, one mind declares himself to be an infallible tsar because he possesses force, coercion and fraud as his licensed weapons--and his victim(s) become those who must bow down to his tyranny--obey or suffer harm for no crime, no fault, no reason except that they are not of the tsarist class as he is. The case is that clear.

Keep the Internet free as a level-playing field for all of us. I warn you of the consequences to you as a citizen of this country if you listen to would-be felons, tyrants and control freaks in corporate seats of illicit power. I warn you of what those like me--defenders of liberty--will do to avenge our rights, legally, if these are interfered with this time.

I ask you simply to do the Constitutional job you were given power solely to do responsibly: to secure my rights and yours, my life and yours, my liberty and yours, my pursuit of prioritized goals of happiness and yours: keep the Internet free.

Thank you for doing the American thing.